



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/275,273	03/23/1999	FRANK P. HART	42390.P5368	9527

7590 09/15/2005

PAUL A. MENDONSA
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

MYERS, PAUL R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2112

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/275,273

Applicant(s)

HART ET AL.

Examiner

Paul R. Myers

Art Unit

2112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-21 and 24-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-21 and 24-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19-21, 24-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicants arguments that the first power source and the second power source are shown in the drawings. Applicants have in their arguments pointed to the primary voltage regulator (210) as the first power source and the secondary voltage regulator (220) as the second power source. The claim language however states "a primary voltage regulator to provide primary power to a load from at least one of a first power source or a second power source" and "a second voltage regulator to selectively provide power to the load from the second power source". The claim language also states the first power source is a battery and the second power source is an AC line adapter. It is clear from the claim language and applicants specification (page 11) that the first power source (battery) is not the primary voltage regulator, and the second power source (AC adapter) is not the secondary voltage regulator.

In regards to applicants argument that Bates does not disclose a secondary voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load: This is clearly incorrect. In figure 2 of Bates when only regulator 10a is active the maximum power output is 10 watts. The feedback circuit 23 (figure 1) of regulator 10a detects that additional power is required and activates regulator 10b thus increasing the maximum power output to 20 watts (see Column 4 line 52 to column 5 line 24). The examiner also notes that Bates has the re-added claim feature of "the primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the load

Art Unit: 2112

and to control” an “additional voltage regulator”, Bates chains feedback circuits as in applicants figure 4. However since Burstein has already been upheld at the board for teaching this re-added feature. The reference to Burstein et al is cited for teaching this re-added feature.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the primary voltage regulator to provide power to a load from at least one of a first power source or a second power source, a second voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load from the second power source based at least in part on the availability of the second power source, a processor module containing the primary voltage regulator and the load, and a motherboard to which the processor module is coupled, said motherboard containing the secondary voltage regulator must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the

Art Unit: 2112

renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 19-21, 24, 27, 29-31, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burstein et al PN 6,268,716 in view of Shintomi PN 5,598,089.

In regards to claims 19 and 29: Burstein et al teaches a primary voltage regulator (the first 16 and 18 taken together) to provide primary power to a load (14) from a power source (12) the primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit (18) to detect power supplied to the load and to control any additional voltage regulators (The additional 16's); and a secondary voltage regulator (the next 16) to selectively provide additional power to the load from the power source. Burstein et al does not teach a first and second power source and the second voltage regulator providing additional power based at least in part on the availability of the second power source. Shintomi teaches an apparatus (figure 1) comprising: a primary voltage regulator (7) to provide

Art Unit: 2112

primary power (output of 7) to a load (inherent) from at least one of a first power source (10) or a second power source (2); and a second voltage regulator (6) to selectively (based upon the presence of the source 2) provide additional power (output of 6) to the load from the second power source (2) based at least in part on the availability of the second power source (Column 3 line 35 to Column 4 line 14). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide separate power sources and activate the additional regulators based on the availability of a line AC because this would have allowed for an uninterruptible power supply (UPS). Alternatively it would have been obvious to provide feedback to a controller in the system of Shintomi because this would have allowed for greater power output control.

In regards to claim 20: Shintomi teaches the first power source comprises a battery (10) and the second power source comprises an alternating current (AC) line adapter (2).

In regards to claims 21, 30 and 33: Burstein teaches the feedback circuit in the primary voltage regulator to control the secondary voltage regulator to provide the additional power if a load power reaches a threshold level. Shintomi teaches supplying power from the second voltage regulator is second power is available.

In regards to claims 24 and 31: Burstein teaches a tertiary voltage regulator to detachably couple with the load (disabled), said tertiary voltage regulator to selectively provide further additional power to the load from the power source. Shintomi teaches providing power based upon availability of the power source.

In regards to claim 27: Burstein teaches a feedback network to couple to the load, the primary voltage regulator, the secondary voltage regulator, and the tertiary voltage regulator,

Art Unit: 2112

said feedback network to control the secondary voltage regulator to provide the additional power if a load power reaches a first threshold level and the second power source is available, and to control the tertiary voltage regulator to provide the further additional power if the load power reaches a second threshold level and both the tertiary voltage regulator and the second power source are available.

5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintomi PN 5,598,089 in view of Burstein PN 6,268,716 as applied to claim 24 further in view of Yanagisawa PN 6,078,109.

In regards to claim 25: Shintomi and Burstein teach general purpose power supplies and is silent upon possible locations for the regulators. Yanagisawa teaches a mobile computer (100), said mobile computer containing the primary voltage regulator (12), and the load (13); and a docking station to detachably receive the mobile computer (200), said docking station containing the tertiary voltage regulator (22). Shintomi teaches the secondary voltage regulator,

6. Claims 26, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintomi PN 5,598,089 in view of Burstein et al PN 6,268,716 and Yanagisawa PN 6,078,109 as applied to claim 25 further in view of Tracy PN 6,191,943.

In regards to claims 26 and 32: Yanagisawa does not teach thermal heat dissipation for the docked third voltage regulator. Tracy teaches active heat dissipation for the docked notebook.

Art Unit: 2112

It would have been obvious to add heat dissipation because this would have protected the notebook from overheating.

7. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintomi PN 5,598,089 in view of Burstein PN 6,268,716 as applied to claim 24 and further in view of Norris PN 5,630,148.

In regards to claim 28: Burstein teaches a variable load. Burstein however is silent as to the type of load. Norris teaches a load that has at least a low performance mode, a medium performance mode, and a high performance mode.

8. Claims 19-21, 24, 27, 29-30, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shintomi PN 5,598,089 in view of Bates PN 3,521,150

In regards to claims 19, 29: Shintomi teaches an apparatus (figure 1) comprising: a primary voltage regulator (7) to provide primary power (output of 7) to a load (inherent) from at least one of a first power source (10) or a second power source (2); and a second voltage regulator (6) to selectively (based upon the presence of the source 2) provide additional power (output of 6) to the load from the second power source (2) based at least in part on the availability of the second power source (Column 3 line 35 to Column 4 line 14). Bates teaches a feedback network (Voltage response circuit) coupled to a load and a plurality of regulators (6 regulators) to control the additional voltage regulators to provide additional power if a load power reaches a threshold (Figure 2). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2112

the art at the time of the invention to provide a feedback for switching on additional regulators because this would have allowed for handling greater load requirements.

In regards to claim 20: Shintomi teaches the first power source comprises a battery (10) and the second power source comprises an alternating current (AC) line adapter (2).

In regards to claims 21, 30, 33: Shintomi teaches the plural voltage regulators as described above. Shintomi does not teach a feedback network coupled to the load, the primary voltage regulator, and the secondary voltage regulator, said feedback network to control the secondary voltage regulator to provide the additional power if a load power reaches a threshold level. Bates teaches a feedback network (Voltage response circuit) coupled to a load and a plurality of regulators (6 regulators) to control the additional voltage regulators to provide additional power if a load power reaches a threshold (Figure 2). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a feedback for switching on additional regulators because this would have allowed for handling greater load requirements.

In regards to claim 24: Bates teaches a tertiary voltage regulator to detachably couple with the load, said tertiary voltage regulator to selectively provide further additional power to the load from the power source. Shintomi teaches providing power based upon availability of the power source.

In regards to claim 27: Bates teaches a feedback network to couple to the load, the primary voltage regulator, the secondary voltage regulator, and the tertiary voltage regulator, said feedback network to control the secondary voltage regulator to provide the additional power if a load power reaches a first threshold level and the second power source is available, and to control the tertiary voltage regulator to provide the further additional power if the load power

Art Unit: 2112

reaches a second threshold level and both the tertiary voltage regulator and the second power source are available.

9. Claims 25, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintomi PN 5,598,089 in view of Bates PN 3,521,150 as applied to claim 24 further in view of Yanagisawa PN 6,078,109.

In regards to claim 25: Shintomi teaches a general purpose power supply and is silent upon possible locations for the regulators. Yanagisawa teaches a mobile computer (100), said mobile computer containing the primary voltage regulator (12), and the load (13); and a docking station to detachably receive the mobile computer (200), said docking station containing the tertiary voltage regulator (22). Shintomi teaches the secondary voltage regulator,

In regards to claim 31: Yanagisawa teaches a detachable voltage regulator.

10. Claims 26 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintomi PN 5,598,089 in view of Bates PN 3,521,150 and Yanagisawa PN 6,078,109 as applied to claim 25 further in view of Tracy PN 6,191,943.

In regards to claims 26, 32: Yanagisawa does not teach thermal heat dissipation for the docked third voltage regulator. Tracy teaches active heat dissipation for the docked notebook. It would have been obvious to add heat dissipation because this would have protected the notebook from overheating.

Art Unit: 2112

11. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintomi PN 5,598,089 in view of Bates PN 3,521,150 as applied to claim 24 and further in view of Norris PN 5,630,148.

In regards to claim 28: Bates teaches a variable load. Bates however is silent as to the type of load. Norris teaches a load that has at least a low performance mode, a medium performance mode, and a high performance mode.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2112

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul R. Myers whose telephone number is 571 272 3639. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on 571-272-3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRM
September 13, 2005



PAUL R. MYERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER